

ED 399 273

TM 025 431

TITLE New Hampshire Educational Assessment Report, Grade 3.

INSTITUTION New Hampshire State Dept. of Education, Concord.

PUB DATE May 94

NOTE 23p.; For the "End-of-Grade Three" report, see TM 025 433.

PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; \*Achievement Tests; Constructed Response; \*Educational Assessment; \*Grade 3; Knowledge Level; Language Arts; Mathematics Education; Multiple Choice Tests; Primary Education; School Districts; \*State Programs; \*Testing Programs; \*Test Results

IDENTIFIERS \*New Hampshire

## ABSTRACT

The New Hampshire State Department of Education in conjunction with the state board and the Legislature, has implemented a new statewide educational improvement and assessment program. The purpose of the program is "to establish what New Hampshire students should know and be able to do and to develop and implement effective methods for assessing that learning and its application so that local decisions about curriculum development and delivery can be made." This first "Educational Assessment Report" contains district-level benchmark data on student performance at the end of the primary grades, data that can be the baseline for charting educational progress over time. The statewide assessment New Hampshire uses to evaluate its third-grade students employs a mix of multiple-choice and open-ended items to assess students' knowledge and their ability to apply that knowledge. In this first assessment, third graders were tested in language arts and mathematics. Nearly all of the state's 16,092 third graders took the examination; less than 3% were excluded for language difficulties or learning disabilities. The summaries of results include information on the numbers and percentages of students at each proficiency level, the performance of students in subgroups of interest, and other information districts can use to compare the performance of their students to that of other districts. Information is summarized for the whole state for language arts and mathematics, and for each of the state's districts. (Contains three tables.) (SLD)

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*

\* from the original document. \*

\*\*\*\*\*

Elizabeth M. Twomey  
COMMISSIONER



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
State Office Park South  
101 Pleasant Street  
Concord, N.H. 03301  
November 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)  
☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
☐ Minor changes have been made to  
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this  
document do not necessarily represent  
official OERI position or policy.

TO: Citizens, School Board Members, and School Personnel

FROM: Dr. Elizabeth M. Twomey, Commissioner *Elizabeth M. Twomey*  
The Department of Education, in conjunction with the State Board and the Legislature, has implemented a new statewide educational improvement and assessment program. As stated in the enabling legislation, RSA 193-C, the purpose of this program is "to establish what New Hampshire students should know and be able to do and to develop and implement effective methods for assessing that learning and its application so that local decisions about curriculum development and delivery can be made."

Challenging standards for our students have been established in New Hampshire curriculum frameworks developed with input from parents, policymakers, business people, teachers, and administrators. The statewide assessment keyed to these standards is very different from previous assessments. It employs a mix of multiple-choice and open-ended performance items to assess students' knowledge and their ability to apply that knowledge. It provides a measure of the degree to which the new standards are currently being met. In May 1994, New Hampshire's public school third grade students were tested in language arts and mathematics. By May 1996, this effort will be expanded to involve students in grades six and ten, who will be tested in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

This first *Educational Assessment Report* contains district-level, benchmark data on student performance at the end of the primary grades, data which will serve as the baseline for charting educational progress over time. It also provides a rich source of information to support school improvement efforts and facilitate decisions about curriculum, instruction, teacher training, resource-allocation, and staffing.

It is now up to you to use this information to make needed adjustments to instructional programs. We will assist with this important effort through a continuing series of workshops and meetings organized by the Department of Education in cooperation with several statewide organizations. As you begin this process, keep in mind that this is the first annual report on an assessment system that will look at performance over time. With data for multiple years, we will be better able to analyze trends.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the local school staff and countless others who are working to ensure that New Hampshire's youth receive the high quality education needed to adequately prepare them for life and work in the 21st century.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  
*C. H. MARSTON*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



# Educational Improvement and Assessment Program

## EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

District: STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Grade: 3

Code:

Date: MAY 1994



# SUMMARY OF STUDENTS TESTED

 District: STATE OF NH  
 Grade: 3  
 Date: MAY 1994

In order to ensure that the students tested were representative of a district's total student population, districts were expected to administer the full battery of tests to all students with the exception of specifically-excluded educationally disabled students, students with non- and limited-English proficiency who could not meaningfully respond to the test, and students who were absent from school for the entire testing period. If a non-representative population is tested, this will affect the generalizability of results. Since the total number of students tested also affects the generalizability of district-level results, districts with a small number of tested students at this grade level (less than 40) should use caution when interpreting the information included in this report. Cumulative averages of test scores over two or three years are most useful for program evaluation purposes.

	NUMBER			PERCENTAGE		
	16,092			100		
	District		State		District	
	Language Arts	Mathematics	Language Arts	Mathematics	Language Arts	Mathematics
Students enrolled on the day testing began						
Students Tested (took all sessions)			15,585	15,800	97	98
Students Not Included in the Report			507	292	3	2
Excluded Educationally Disabled			426	204	3	1
Excluded Non- or Limited-English-Proficient			18	18	0	0
Absentees			63	70	0	0
NOTE: Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole.						
4						5

## Description of Data Reported

The diagram below will help you identify the various types of data reported for each content area.

### Proficiency Levels

Proficiency levels describe what students at each level know and are able to do. The "cut-points" between levels were established by a process that included a representative group of New Hampshire citizens (both educators and non-educators) brought together for this specific purpose.

### Content Diagnostic Display

Content-area results are broken down into more specific sub-topics (as described in the state's curriculum frameworks) to provide diagnostic information on the district's program.

### Total Possible Points

This column lists the total possible points for each specific sub-topic.

### Summary of Writing Annotations (Language Arts Only)

Writing was evaluated using the Annotated Holistic Scoring Method. Each student's holistic score was determined by two independent readers. In addition, readers identified annotations addressing noteworthy traits of each paper. The annotations reflected either commendations or needs pertaining to the analytic traits of: topic development; organization; details; sentence structure; wording; or mechanics. This section reports the number and percentage of students in the district and state receiving annotations for each of the six traits.

### Reporting Categories

This portion of the report shows the performance of major subgroups of the population of students tested.

**Number and Percentage of Students at Each Proficiency Level**  
This section of the report identifies the distribution of students for the district and the state as a whole who performed at each proficiency level. Space is provided for three years' scores and a cumulative average. This will allow districts to view their own results over time. The number of students at each proficiency level in the District Report is based on both the common and matrix-sampled items. These numbers may be slightly different from the numbers of students at each level listed on the Proficiency Level Class Report because those designations are based on the common items only.

### Sub-Topic Deviation from District Total Score

The deviation from "District Total Score" allows districts to graphically compare each specific sub-topic score to their own total content-area score. The deviation is shown as a diamond with horizontal bars on each side of the diamond representing plus or minus one standard error of measurement.

Deviations are computed by placing all sub-topic scores on a comparable scale that takes the difficulty level of each item into account. As a result, districts can easily compare their performance between and among sub-topics.

### Percentage of Students in Category

These percentages permit districts to compare their students to students statewide.

### Percent Basic or Above and Percent Proficient or Above

These two columns allow districts to evaluate the correlation of these practices to student performance statewide.

**NH**  
New Hampshire  
Department of Education

**LANGUAGE ARTS RESULTS**

District: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				

Students at Each Proficiency Level

Proficiency Levels	District		State	
	N	%	N	%
1993-94				
1994-95				
1995-96				
Cumulative Average				



Educational Improvement and  
Assessment Program

# LANGUAGE ARTS RESULTS

District: STATE OF NH  
Grade: 3  
Date: MAY 1994

## Proficiency Levels

	Students at Each Proficiency Level	State		
		District		%
		N	%	
<b>Advanced:</b> Students at this level demonstrate a thorough comprehension of the materials they read, hear, and view. They are able to identify main and subordinate ideas, supporting details, and facts. They use comparisons and predictions to increase their level of understanding. They can draw conclusions and make critical judgements. Their responses are detailed and reflect careful thought. When writing, they communicate clearly and effectively. They can organize ideas, develop a topic, add supporting detail, and vary both sentence structure and vocabulary. They make few, if any, mechanical errors.	1993-94 1994-95 1995-96 Cumulative Average			1
<b>Proficient:</b> Students at this level demonstrate an overall understanding of the materials they read, hear, and view. They are able to identify main ideas and draw conclusions. Their responses show thought and are supported with some detail. When writing, they communicate competently and are able to adequately develop and support their ideas. Although they demonstrate a firm grounding in the mechanics of written expression, they may make some errors in spelling and grammar. However, these do not interfere with a reader's ability to understand the text.	1993-94 1994-95 1995-96 Cumulative Average			15
<b>Basic:</b> Students at this level are able to determine the literal meaning of the materials they read, hear, and view. They can identify clearly-stated main ideas and make direct comparisons. Their responses are sometimes incomplete and are supported with few details. When writing, they communicate at a rudimentary level. Although they employ both simple and more-complex sentences, overall their work shows elementary organization, development, and use of detail. While they demonstrate a fundamental control of mechanics, they may make errors in spelling and grammar.	1993-94 1994-95 1995-96 Cumulative Average			48
<b>Novice:</b> Students at this level are at the beginning of their literacy development. They extract limited meaning from what they read, hear, and view. Although they may be able to locate major details, they are often unable to identify clearly-stated main ideas. When writing, they have difficulty communicating. While it may be related to the point they are trying to make, their written work is minimal and shows little organization, development, or use of detail. A disproportionate number of errors in capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and grammar interfere with a reader's ability to understand the text.	1993-94 1994-95 1995-96 Cumulative Average			33
<b>Students Not Included in the Report:</b>	1993-94 1994-95 1995-96 Cumulative Average			3

## Content Diagnostic Display

Sub-Topic		Sub-Topic Deviation from District Total Score (Based on Percent Correct Adjusted for Item Difficulty)			
Total Possible Points		-30	-20	-10	0
8	Reading literary/narrative content/informational practical Listening/Viewing Writing (weighted)				
112					
38					
43					
31					
11					
66					

This section will reflect district level information.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# LANGUAGE ARTS RESULTS (CONTINUED)

 District: STATE OF NH  
 Grade: 3  
 Date: MAY 1994

Summary of Writing Annotations					
Analytic Traits	District		State		
	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	Number of Students	Percentage of Students	
Topic Development Commendations Needs	6,060 9,929		6,060 9,929	39 64	
Organization Commendations Needs	8,739 4,576		8,739 4,576	56 29	
Details Commendations Needs	4,920 7,872		4,920 7,872	32 51	
Sentence Structure Commendations Needs	3,354 2,536		3,354 2,536	22 16	
Word Commendations Needs	1,055 919		1,055 919	7 6	
Mechanics Commendations Needs	1,884 2,442		1,884 2,442	12 16	
Reporting Categories	District		State		
	% Students in category	% Basic or above	% Students in category	% Basic or above	% Proficient or above
Gender					
Boy			51	60	12
Girl			49	72	20
Chapter 1 Program					
Yes			12	30	2
No			88	71	18
Reading Recovery Program					
Yes			1	25	1
No			99	66	16
English Language Fluency					
Monolingual English			98	65	16
Bilingual and Limited-English-Proficient			1	31	2
Bilingual and Fluent-English-Proficient			1	53	11
Educational Disability					
Yes			11	21	1
No			89	71	18
Kindergarten					
Yes			89	68	17
No			8	52	8

Questionnaire Items	District		State		
	% Students in category	% Basic or above	% Students in category	% Basic or above	% Proficient or above
How often do you write about books that you have read?					
Most of the time			34	64	16
About half the time			28	71	18
Less than half the time			19	67	16
Never or hardly ever			18	61	12
When you are working on a piece of writing, how often do you have the chance to share what you have written with other students?					
Most of the time			37	68	18
About half the time			29	69	18
Less than half the time			21	66	15
Never or hardly ever			13	54	9
How often do you have in-school time to read books of your own choice?					
Every day			77	67	17
Two or three times each week			15	68	15
Once a week			4	55	11
Less than once a week			2	53	9
Never or almost never			2	45	5
How often do you have the chance to write more than one draft while working on a piece of writing?					
Most of the time			56	68	18
About half the time			24	65	13
Less than half the time			12	62	13
Never or hardly ever			7	61	13

11





Educational Improvement and  
Assessment Program

# MATHEMATICS RESULTS

District: STATE OF NH  
Grade: 3  
Date: MAY 1994

	Proficiency Levels	Students at Each Proficiency Level			
			District		State
			N	%	
<b>Advanced:</b> Students at this level are able to solve problems and communicate their answers and problem-solving strategies clearly and concisely. They can accurately add, subtract, and multiply whole numbers to the same extent as proficient students. They have an understanding of fractions and decimals and can add and subtract decimals in everyday situations. They are able to: make estimations; use models to demonstrate mathematical concepts; draw conclusions from information presented in charts and graphs; identify, classify, and compare geometric objects; measure accurately; construct simple charts and graphs; and recognize, describe, extend, and create a variety of patterns.		1993-94			2
		1994-95			
		1995-96			2
		Cumulative Average			
<b>Proficient:</b> Students at this level are able to estimate and compute solutions to problems and communicate their understanding of mathematics. They can, with reasonable accuracy, add 3-digit whole numbers; subtract any two 2-digit whole numbers; and multiply whole numbers up to 5. They are able to: demonstrate an understanding of place value as well as the relationship between simple fractions and decimals; read charts and graphs; make measurements; and recognize and extend patterns.		1993-94			16
		1994-95			
		1995-96			16
		Cumulative Average			
<b>Basic:</b> Students at this level are able to multiply whole numbers up to 5 with reasonable accuracy. They can add and subtract 1-digit whole numbers with ease. When adding or subtracting 2-digit whole numbers, regrouping (borrowing and carrying) presents a challenge. They demonstrate a rudimentary understanding of place value, fractional parts, geometry, and measurement. They can recognize and extend simple patterns and read uncomplicated charts and graphs. They demonstrate limited skill in the application of mathematics to problem-solving situations.		1993-94			47
		1994-95			
		1995-96			47
		Cumulative Average			
<b>Novice:</b> Students at this level are able to add and subtract 1- and 2-digit whole numbers without regrouping (borrowing and carrying). However, they frequently make errors in these computations. They can recite whole-number multiplication facts up to 5. Although they have some knowledge of place value, fractions, geometry, and measurement, their understanding of these areas is extremely limited. They are unable to demonstrate the application of mathematical skills to problem-solving situations.		1993-94			34
		1994-95			
		1995-96			34
		Cumulative Average			
<b>Students Not Included in the Report:</b>		1993-94			2
		1994-95			
		1995-96			2
		Cumulative Average			

## Content Diagnostic Display

Total Possible Points	Sub-Topic	Sub-Topic Deviation from District Total Score (Based on Percent Correct Adjusted for Item Difficulty)						
		-30	-20	-10	District Total Score	10	20	30
52	Curriculum Goals 1 & 2 problem solving/reasoning/communication/ connections							
48	Curriculum Goal 3 numbers/numeration/operations							
24	Curriculum Goal 4 geometry/measurement							
15	Curriculum Goal 5 data analysis							
		This section will reflect district level information.						
		13						



# MATHEMATICS RESULTS (CONTINUED)

District: STATE OF NH  
Grade: 3  
Date: MAY 1994

Reporting Categories	District			State		
	% Students in category	% Basic or above category	% Proficient or above category	% Students in category	% Basic or above category	% Proficient or above category
<b>Gender</b>						
Boy						
Girl						
<b>Chapter 1 Program</b>						
Yes						
No						
<b>English Language Fluency</b>						
Monolingual English						
Bilingual and Limited-English-Proficient						
Bilingual and Fluent-English-Proficient						
<b>Educational Disability</b>						
Yes						
No						
<b>Kindergarten</b>						
Yes						
No						
<b>14</b>						
<b>Questionnaire Items</b>						
<b>How often do you use hands-on materials such as geoboards, cubes, rods, counters, tangrams, etc. in math class?</b>						
Almost every day						
A few times a week						
A few times a month						
A few times a year						
Never						
<b>How often do you use a calculator in math class?</b>						
Almost every day						
A few times a week						
A few times a month						
A few times a year						
Never						
<b>How do you feel about math compared to other subjects you study in school?</b>						
It is my favorite subject.						
It is one of my favorite subjects.						
There are other subjects I like better.						
It is my least favorite subject.						
<b>15</b>						



**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**END-OF-GRADE-THREE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT**  
**MAY 1993-94**

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT**  
**(PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS AT EACH PROFICIENCY LEVEL)**

Educational Improvement and  
Assessment Program

District Code	District Name	No. of Grade 3 Students	Language Arts Proficiency					Mathematics Proficiency				
			Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)	Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)
000	STATE OF NH	16,092	1	15	48	33	3	2	16	47	34	2
009	ALLENSTOWN	84	0	7	35	58	0	0	2	52	45	0
015	ALTON	50	2	28	52	12	6	12	30	48	8	2
017	AMHERST	149	0	29	57	14	0	3	25	60	13	0
019	ANDOVER	31	0	3	45	52	0	0	0	39	61	0
023	ASHLAND	27	0	19	63	11	7	4	11	48	30	7
029	AUBURN	67	0	30	42	28	0	4	21	49	24	1
031	BARNSTEAD	35	0	9	46	34	11	0	23	51	23	3
033	BARRINGTON	102	0	10	52	36	2	1	11	55	31	2
035	BARTLETT	45	0	18	53	29	0	2	31	53	13	0
039	BATH	13	0	8	23	69	0	0	0	38	62	0
041	BEDFORD	258	3	23	54	20	0	2	19	53	26	0
051	BERLIN	114	0	5	46	31	18	1	9	47	37	6
053	BETHLEHEM	40	0	18	53	25	5	0	20	55	20	5
057	BOW	116	3	29	52	16	0	4	41	41	14	0
063	BRENTWOOD	34	0	12	50	32	6	0	12	53	32	3
071	BROOKLINE	62	0	11	52	37	0	0	15	53	32	0
075	CAMPTON	37	0	5	54	38	3	0	14	59	24	3
079	CANDIA	59	2	31	54	14	0	0	26	53	21	0
083	CHESTER	33	0	21	48	27	3	3	21	48	27	0
095	CHESTERFIELD	61	2	11	36	48	3	0	16	39	43	2
099	CHICHESTER	28	0	11	39	36	14	0	11	39	50	0
101	CLAREMONT	175	1	7	37	53	3	0	5	37	57	1
105	COLEBROOK	46	0	9	33	59	0	0	4	52	43	0
111	CONCORD	453	1	18	43	35	3	1	12	47	38	1
112	CONTOOCOOK VALLEY	223	0	14	56	28	3	2	16	52	29	1
113	CONWAY	132	0	5	56	35	4	1	14	52	32	2
115	CORNISH	27	0	4	56	41	0	0	11	37	52	0
127	DEERFIELD	50	0	6	56	38	0	0	0	54	46	0
131	DERRY	532	1	18	47	32	2	1	10	50	37	2
141	DOVER	241	0	17	51	32	0	2	20	41	37	0
149	DUNBARTON	25	0	12	48	40	0	4	20	48	28	0
153	EAST KINGSTON	26	0	15	38	31	15	0	15	77	8	0
165	EPHING	78	0	14	33	53	0	1	9	46	44	0
167	EPSOM	51	0	16	47	33	4	6	35	29	27	2

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**END-OF-GRADE-THREE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT**  
**MAY 1993-94**  
**SUMMARY OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT**  
**(PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS AT EACH PROFICIENCY LEVEL)**

District Code	District Name	No. of Grade 3 Students	Language Arts Proficiency					Mathematics Proficiency				
			Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)	Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)
173	EXETER	220	1	26	41	29	2	2	34	52	10	2
174	FALL MOUNTAIN REGIONAL	180	0	9	51	36	4	1	18	48	31	3
175	FARMINGTON	102	0	5	43	48	4	0	9	43	45	3
185	FRANKLIN	145	0	6	26	61	7	0	5	26	66	3
189	FREMONT	38	0	24	53	24	0	0	8	61	32	0
191	GILFORD	90	2	17	59	21	1	0	16	59	26	0
195	GILMANTON	44	0	18	55	25	2	5	16	45	34	0
199	GOFFSTOWN	165	1	14	49	34	2	1	8	48	42	1
201	GORHAM	54	0	9	54	30	7	0	24	46	30	0
207	GOSHEN-LEMPSTER COOP.	35	0	6	54	29	11	0	11	37	51	0
208	GOV. WENTWORTH REG.	215	1	12	47	38	2	0	16	47	35	1
211	GRANTHAM	20	0	10	50	30	10	0	10	45	45	0
215	GREENLAND	43	0	35	53	12	0	2	44	47	7	0
223	HAMPSTEAD	135	1	25	58	16	1	4	31	44	20	1
225	HAMPTON	148	0	15	49	34	2	3	19	47	28	2
227	HAMPTON FALLS	21	0	14	57	29	0	5	24	52	19	0
233	HANOVER	91	0	31	51	16	2	3	35	47	12	2
238	HAVERHILL COOPERATIVE	56	0	11	38	45	7	2	20	45	29	5
245	HENNIKER	61	0	23	56	18	3	5	20	52	21	2
251	HILLSBORO DEERING COOP.	85	1	7	46	39	7	1	22	48	24	5
255	HINSDALE	66	0	11	42	47	0	0	9	48	42	0
257	HOLDERNESSE	33	0	33	39	24	3	3	27	58	9	3
259	HOLLIS	103	2	28	60	10	0	1	21	65	13	0
261	HOOKSETT	132	0	5	45	42	7	1	9	48	38	5
263	HOPKINTON	74	1	15	53	31	0	5	22	47	23	3
267	HUDSON	314	0	16	46	33	5	3	19	48	27	3
269	INTER-LAKES	119	0	16	47	32	5	3	13	46	34	4
274	JAFFREY-RINDGE COOP.	120	1	10	63	25	2	2	13	53	30	3
276	KEARSARGE REGIONAL	153	0	10	54	27	8	4	24	46	21	6
279	KEENE	253	1	14	51	30	4	1	14	50	33	3
281	KENSINGTON	27	0	26	74	0	0	4	15	63	19	0
285	LACONIA	225	0	9	43	42	5	3	9	42	45	1
288	LAFAYETTE REGIONAL	22	0	0	86	14	0	0	9	73	18	0
295	LEBANON	178	2	15	33	50	0	1	16	38	45	1
305	LINCOLN-WOODSTOCK	31	0	3	45	52	0	0	10	42	48	0

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
**END-OF-GRADE-THREE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT**  
**MAY 1993-94**

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT**  
**(PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS AT EACH PROFICIENCY LEVEL)**

Educational Improvement and  
Assessment Program

District Code	District Name	No. of Grade 3 Students	Language Arts Proficiency					Mathematics Proficiency				
			Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)	Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)
306	LISBON REGIONAL	21	0	29	48	24	0	5	19	43	33	0
315	LITCHFIELD	115	0	17	59	23	1	3	22	52	22	1
317	LITTLETON	83	1	16	48	27	8	4	24	48	24	0
319	LONDONDERRY	415	1	18	52	28	1	1	16	53	30	0
327	LYME	31	0	19	65	16	0	3	35	45	16	0
329	LYNDEBOROUGH	16	0	6	31	63	0	0	13	38	50	0
333	MADISON	32	0	6	28	66	0	0	9	31	59	0
335	MANCHESTER	1157	0	11	43	41	5	0	9	38	50	3
339	MARLBOROUGH	22	0	0	23	73	5	0	0	41	59	0
342	MASCENIC REGIONAL	124	0	20	59	19	2	1	21	58	19	2
343	MASCOMA VALLEY REG.	114	1	11	52	32	4	0	26	46	23	4
351	MERRIMACK	357	1	20	54	25	1	1	12	50	37	1
352	MERRIMACK VALLEY	222	0	9	44	43	5	0	7	44	47	1
355	MILAN	27	0	15	56	19	11	0	11	41	44	4
357	MILFORD	209	0	11	58	30	1	1	13	48	37	1
359	MILTON	60	0	10	50	33	7	0	8	47	42	3
363	MONADNOCK REGIONAL	212	1	9	39	51	0	1	7	47	45	0
365	MONROE	11	0	18	55	27	0	0	45	45	9	0
367	MONT VERNON	17	0	12	47	41	0	0	0	82	18	0
369	MOULTONBOROUGH	57	0	19	47	30	4	0	18	49	33	0
371	NASHUA	1068	1	14	48	32	5	3	19	45	28	4
377	NEW BOSTON	59	0	19	59	19	3	2	29	53	14	3
387	NEWFIELDS	13	8	15	31	46	0	0	23	38	38	0
388	NEWFOUND AREA	118	1	12	39	47	2	0	12	40	48	0
399	NEWMARKET	111	0	15	51	32	2	1	13	51	33	2
401	NEWPORT	89	0	7	36	55	2	0	4	28	65	2
405	NORTH HAMPTON	45	4	20	44	31	0	9	31	44	16	0
407	NORTHUMBERLAND	50	0	10	44	34	12	0	16	44	32	8
411	NORTHWOOD	52	0	13	29	54	4	6	6	35	52	2
413	NOTTINGHAM	50	0	8	54	38	0	0	18	46	34	2
417	ORFORD	16	0	6	44	44	6	0	13	56	31	0
423	OYSTER RIVER COOP.	203	0	26	51	22	1	3	26	49	21	0
425	PELHAM	149	0	17	58	23	2	1	19	56	22	2
427	PEMBROKE	124	0	10	46	42	2	1	6	37	54	2
439	PITTSFIELD	56	0	5	29	61	5	0	9	27	58	5

# END-OF-GRADE-THREE EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT MAY 1993-94

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS BY DISTRICT (PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS AT EACH PROFICIENCY LEVEL)

District Code	District Name	No. of Grade 3 Students	Language Arts Proficiency					Mathematics Proficiency				
			Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)	Advanced (%)	Proficient (%)	Basic (%)	Novice (%)	Not Tested (%)
441	PLAINFIELD	36	0	11	50	33	6	0	17	44	33	6
447	PLYMOUTH	63	2	24	49	24	2	6	21	41	29	3
449	PORTSMOUTH	200	1	19	46	34	1	4	27	46	24	1
453	RAYMOND	183	1	9	47	40	3	1	4	45	47	3
461	ROCHESTER	388	0	9	47	39	5	0	7	50	41	1
463	ROLLINSFORD	30	0	7	63	30	0	3	7	53	37	0
467	RUMNEY	28	4	11	43	43	0	0	7	21	71	0
471	RYE	38	0	26	61	13	0	11	32	53	5	0
473	SALEM	353	1	21	53	21	4	2	20	58	19	1
476	SANBORN REGIONAL	153	3	26	45	24	1	2	19	48	30	1
485	SEABROOK	60	2	12	45	40	2	0	10	47	42	2
486	SHAKER REGIONAL	135	0	17	50	27	7	2	20	52	23	3
491	SOMERSWORTH	160	1	8	43	48	2	0	11	33	55	2
495	SOUTH HAMPTON	11	0	27	45	27	0	9	45	27	18	0
507	STRAFFORD	53	2	28	51	19	0	4	30	55	11	0
509	STRATFORD	11	0	45	36	18	0	0	50	30	20	0
511	STRATHAM	97	4	31	47	18	0	1	19	66	14	0
515	SUNAPEE	33	0	3	58	36	3	0	3	42	55	0
525	TAMWORTH	28	4	18	50	29	0	4	25	50	21	0
531	THORNTON	20	0	15	55	20	10	0	25	55	20	0
534	TIMBERLANE REGIONAL	307	0	16	59	24	1	0	16	50	33	1
539	UNITY	14	0	0	7	86	7	0	0	7	86	7
543	WAKEFIELD	55	0	13	38	45	4	0	18	44	38	0
555	WEARE	119	0	22	58	17	3	0	27	61	11	1
563	WESTMORELAND	27	0	19	48	30	4	0	22	59	15	4
568	WHITE MOUNTAIN REG.	121	3	12	46	29	9	2	12	55	27	2
571	WILTON	48	0	6	44	50	0	2	10	63	25	0
573	WINCHESTER	54	0	0	43	54	4	0	7	46	46	0
575	WINDHAM	135	0	21	62	12	4	3	33	47	16	2
582	WINNISQUAM REGIONAL	177	0	8	42	50	1	1	10	46	43	1
22												23



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*  
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*



## NOTICE

### REPRODUCTION BASIS



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").